REMARKS

The specification was objected to because of a typographical error found by the Examiner in paragraph 6. The Examiner required correction for reasons not related to the patentability of the claimed subject matter. The typographical error has been corrected by the amendment to paragraph 6, hereinabove.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Eckhardt et al (US Pat. No. 4,835,243). The Examiner contends that Eckhardt teaches that a isotropic part is inherently obtained under the conditions specified therein. The Examiner cites the Applicants' own specification as the basis for this contention.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The portion of the Applicants' specification cited by the Examiner states that an isotropic part "may" be obtained under conditions that result in little or no flow of the molten polymer. The Applicants' statement is not an absolute, and the requirement is that the conditions employed must be those where little or no flow of the molten polymer is realized. Obtaining an isotropic part is not necessarily the case when compression molding is practiced. Basing an inherency argument on the Applicants' statement is therefore erroneous, since the foundation of inherence comes from the fact that a particular result must be obtained. To the contrary, in fact, it is generally the case that compression molding results in substantial flow of molten polymer, since the melt must flow to fill the mold. The Applicants' method involves heating the polymer to a temperature just above its melting point in order to obtain a viscous, homogeneous melt (see page 6, line 25 of the specification). The Applicants' intent is to avoid melt flow by maintaining high melt viscosity, while at the same time minimizing the shear forces exerted on the melt. which is a key to obtaining an isotropic part. Eckhardt makes no attempt to use a high viscosity melt or reduce shear forces, and in fact teaches away from the present invention at column 4, lines 54 to 63. Therefore, the Applicants request that the rejection of the Claim based on Eckhardt be reversed.

The Examiner rejects Claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Kock, et al. (EP 0 239 036). The Examiner contends that the injection embossing process that employs a thermotropic liquid crystalline polymer such that an isotropic molded part is obtained.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The injection embossing process taught by Kock is very far from the claimed invention. The injection embossing process is a process whereby a melt is injected into a mold, rather than – as the presently claimed invention requires – placing a powder composition into a mold. Therefore Kock does not anticipate the claimed invention.

There is no question that this is a difference between the teachings of the two applications. This is a difference that is not trivial. Injection molding is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art to create high shear forces on a polymer melt, and by its very nature this will create anisotropic behavior. LCP's are well known to develop anistropic behavior when exposed to high shear forces. Therefore it would be very surprising if Kock's method produced an isotropic part from an LCP. The Examiner's citation to Kock's claim to an isotropic molded article at page 2, paragraph 9 was not found by the Applicants. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner may have misread Kock, or perhaps the citation is to the wrong paragraph. The Applicants request clarification as to whether the citation is correct.

The Applicants submit that the rejection of the Claim as anticipated by the references has been fully addressed herein, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn, and that the Claim be allowed instead.

Respectfully submitted,

KEVIN S. DOBSON
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Registration No.: 40,296
Telephone: (302) 892-5526
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated: September 5, 2006